REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action mailed March 3, 2009 and the Advisory Action mailed May 13, 2009, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 1-11 were previously pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1 and 5 have been amended. As a result, claims 1-11 are pending for examination with claims 1 and 5 being independent claims. No new matter has been added.

I. Summary of Telephone Conference with Examiner

Applicant's representatives appreciate the courtesies extended by Examiners Lee and Nguyen in granting and conducting a telephone conference on April 1, 2009. During the telephone conference, Applicant's representatives briefly provided the Examiners with an overview of embodiments representative of the claimed subject matter in claim 5 and discussed the cited reference Booth. Following this discussion, the Examiners indicated that claim amendments more clearly defining the process of how the access controller detects an availability of a digital signal from a network would appear to distinguish over Booth, although the Examiner reserved final judgment pending his review of the claim amendments presented herein.

Applicant's representatives agreed to amend the claims according to the Examiner's suggestions to further prosecution of the application. Applicant respectfully requests that these amendments be entered as they merely adopt suggestions raised by the Examiner in the telephone conference. A further summary of the telephone conference is provided herein as detailed in the remarks below.

I. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejects claims 5-7 (including independent claim 5) under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,065073 ("Booth"). In view of the amendments disclosed herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections.

A. Booth Fails To Disclose or Suggest All Limitations of Independent Claim 5

Claim 5 as amended recites, "[a]n electronic apparatus comprising: a connector jack for connection of a network cable; an access controller for detecting an electrical connection or

disconnection between the network cable and said connector jack **by detecting an availability of a digital signal at a receiving contact of the connector jack, the digital signal being received from a network**; and a micro-computer; wherein a detection output of said access controller is supplied as an interrupt signal to said micro-computer in response to detecting the availability of the digital signal, and ~~a~~ upon detection of the interrupt signal, said micro-computer executes processing for connection or disconnection of said network cable" (emphasis added).

Booth fails to disclose or suggest "detecting an availability of a digital signal at a receiving contact of the connector jack, the digital signal being received from the network" and "supplying, in response to detecting the availability of the digital signal, a detection output of said access controller as an interrupt signal to said micro-computer" as recited in claim 5.

During the telephone conference the Examiner indicated that he was considering the network interface card (NIC) of Booth to be the access controller recited in claim 5. Applicant's representative explained that unlike the NIC of Booth which monitors an active link of a computer to a local network by polling a status register of a network interface device (e.g., SERDES device 430) included as part of the NIC, the access controller recited in amended claim 5 detects an electrical connection or disconnection between a network cable and a connector jack by detecting the availability of a digital signal **at a receiving contact of the connector jack.**

As described in Applicant's response dated December 23, 2008, Booth describes two methods of monitoring a network connection using a NIC. However, neither of these methods teaches or suggests detecting an availability of a digital signal at a receiving contact of a connector jack of an electronic apparatus. Rather, both of the monitoring methods in Booth poll a status register in a PHY device included as part of a NIC (either continuously or periodically using an auto-polling unit and a management interface), and compare the value in the status register with a previously read status register value to determine the link state (Booth, col. 16, lines 11-13; col. 20, lines 6-8).

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 5 patentably distinguishes over Booth, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn. Claims 6-8 depend from claim 5 and each of these dependent claims patentably distinguishes over Booth for at least the same reasons.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4 and 8 (including independent claim 1) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as purportedly being obvious over Booth in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,149,773 ("Haller"), and rejects claims 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Booth and Haller in view of various other references. In view of the amendments disclosed herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections.

Claim 1 as amended recites, "[a] method for supervising a connection to a network of an electronic apparatus including an access controller for detecting an electrical connection or disconnection of a network cable, and a micro-computer comprising a non-event-driven type operating system, the method comprising: **detecting an availability of a digital signal at a receiving contact of a connector jack of the electronic apparatus, the digital signal being received from the network**..." (emphasis added).

As should be appreciated from the foregoing discussion, Booth fails to disclose or suggest detecting an availability of a digital signal at a receiving contact of a connector jack of an electronic apparatus, the digital signal being received from a network.

Haller fails to cure this deficiency of Booth. Haller is directed to a system for automatically generating invoices for medical services when monitoring certain aspects of the performance of an implanted medical device (Haller, abstract). Haller is unrelated to detecting an electrical connection or disconnection of a network cable to an electronic device, and therefore fails to disclose or suggest detecting such a connection or disconnection by detecting an availability of a digital signal at a receiving contact of a connector jack of the electronic apparatus.

At least for this reason, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the combination of Booth and Haller and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn. Claims 2-4 and 8 depend from claim 1 and each of these dependent claims patentably distinguishes over Booth and Haller for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith to our Deposit Account No. 23/2825, under Docket No. S1459.70084US00.

Dated: June 1, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By Randy J. Pritzker

Randy J. Pritzker
Registration No.: 35,986
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
(617) 646-8000

WGS Date: x06/03/09x